

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

Confirmation No.: **3062**

SIMMELINK et al

Atty. Ref.: **4662-205**

Serial No. **10/584,235**

Group: **1744**

Filed: **September 8, 2006**

Examiner: **HINDENLANG**

For: **PROCESS FOR MAKING HIGH-PERFORMANCE POLYETHYLENE
MULTIFILAMENT YARN**

* * * * *

December 1, 2011

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPLICANTS' REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

This Reply Brief is being submitted within two (2) months of the Examiner's Answer dated October 3, 2011 and is therefore timely pursuant to 37 CFR §41.41.

Applicants note that the Examiner has repeatedly cited in paragraphs 3, 25, 28 and 45 of the Examiner's Answer a passage in Chau et al at column 6, lines 3-5 as follows:

"The size and geometry of the hole are preferably selected
to maximize the stability of the dope flow through the hole."

Although this passage was not quoted in paragraph 10 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner did refer to column 6, lines 3-5 in conjunction with column 5, lines 31-35 and Fig. 1 of Chau et al as teaching a spinneret "where each hold contains (a) an inlet (1) (b) optionally, a transition cone (2) where the hole narrows by an angle (theta)

before entry into a capillary section” for the “purpose of maximizing the stability of flow through the spinhole...”

The full passage at column 6, lines 3-5, however, reads as follows:

“The size and geometry of the hole are preferably selected to maximize the stability of the dope flow through the hole, as described hereinafter.”

Applicants contend therefore that the teaching of selecting “the size and geometry of the hole” is an introduction to the teaching which follows the passage, namely the discussion of the capillary dimension and entry angle of the Chau et al spinneret hole appearing later in column 6. To omit reference to the discussion in Chau et al with as described after the passage at column 6, lines 3-5 thus cause one to inaccurately interpret Chau et al in the manner described in the Examiner’s Answer.

Thus, applicants maintain that the pending claims herein are patentably distinguishable over Chau et al in combination with of Honnaker and/or Kavesh for the reasons already made of record by way of the Applicants’ Brief on Appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Bryan H. Davidson/
Bryan H. Davidson
Reg. No. 30,251

BHD:dlb
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100